



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/743,370

12/22/2003

Daniel Gold

5760-15500

9335

35690

7590

12/12/2007

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.

P.O. BOX 398

AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

CHEA, PHILIP J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/743,370

Applicant(s)

GOLD ET AL.

Examiner

Philip J. Chea

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed September 28, 2007. Claims 1-40 are currently pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,6-10,15-19,21-23,28-32,37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takaoka et al. (US 2003/0085914), herein referred to as Takaoka.

As per claims 1,10,19,23,32, Takaoka discloses a system, as claimed, comprising:

a processor (see paragraph 50); and

a memory comprising program instructions (see paragraph 50), wherein the program instructions are executable by the processor to implement a zone visualization mechanism configured to:

obtain zoning information for a plurality of Storage Area Network (SAN) objects in a SAN, wherein the SAN comprises one or more host systems, one or more storage devices, and one or more fabrics (see Fig. 8, host system [1021], storage devices [1041] and paragraph 63, where fibre channel ports indicate a fabric); and

in response to selecting a particular SAN object in the SAN (see paragraph 102, where a symbol of a storage device (i.e. SAN object) is moved (selected) by a pointing device), display zoning information for the selected SAN object, wherein the zoning information for the selected SAN object indicates one or more zones of the SAN of which the selected SAN object is a member (see paragraph 102, where the

Art Unit: 2153

SAN object is moved into a generated area (a zone) on the screen, thereby displaying that the SAN object is a member of the zone).

As per claims 6,15,28,37, Takaoka further discloses that each of the indicated one or more zones of the SAN of which the selected SAN object is a member is user-selectable to display zone centric information fro the selected zone, wherein the zone-centric information indicates one or more SAN objects that are members of the zone and relationships among the one or more SAN objects that are members of the zone (see paragraphs 62-63).

As per claims 7,16,29,38, Takaoka further discloses that the indicated one or more other SAN objects that are members of the zone are user-selectable to display zoning information for the one or more other SAN objects, wherein the zoning information for each of the one or more other SAN objects indicates one or more zones of the SAN of which the SAN object is a member (see paragraphs 62-63).

As per claims 8,17,30,39, Takaoka further discloses that the zone visualization mechanism is further configured to display the zone-centric information for the selected zone in graphical or textual format (see Fig. 8).

As per claims 9,18,31,40, Takaoka further discloses that the zone visualization mechanism is further configured to display the zoning information for the selected SAN object in the SAN in a graphical format or textual format (see Fig. 8).

As per claim 21, Takaoka further discloses that the displayed zoning information for each zone of which the selected SAN object is a member further indicates another SAN object through which the selected SAN object is connected to the zone, and wherein the system further comprises means for displaying zoning information for the other SAN object, wherein the zoning information for the other SAN object indicates one or more zones of the SAN of which the other SAN object is a member (see Fig. 8).

As per claim 22, Takaoka further discloses displaying zone-centric information for the indicated one or more zones of the SAN of which the selected SAN object is a member, wherein the zone-centric information for a zone indicates one or more SAN objects that are members of the zone and relationships among the one or more SAN objects that are members of the zone (see Fig. 8).

Art Unit: 2153

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2,4-5,11,13-14,20,24,26-27,33,35-36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takaoka as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Anslow et al. (US 2003/0130821), herein referred to as Anslow.

As per claims 2,11,20,24,33, Takaoka further discloses that the displayed zoning information indicates logical zone membership for the selected SAN object (see paragraph 66, describing how logical zone membership is displayed using lines that indicate paths between the SAN objects in the logical zone membership).

Although the system disclosed by Takaoka shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose wherein a SAN object is a logical member of a zone via relationship of the SAN object to one or more other SAN objects that are physical members of the zone.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Takaoka, as evidenced by Anslow.

In an analogous art, Anslow discloses a system for visualization of network devices in a computer user interface (see Abstract), further showing that logical and physical device relationships can be shown in the displayed zoning information (see paragraph 36, describing SAN components and their physical and logical interrelationship, implying logical members in relationship with physical members and paragraph 35, describing zones and the components that are members).

Given the teaching of Anslow, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Takaoka by employing logical zone memberships in relationship to physical zone memberships, such as disclosed by Anslow, in order to manage

Art Unit: 2153

information gathered on the different components in the SAN and providing a visualization of the network topology.

As per claims 4,13,26,35, Anslow further one or more other SAN objects through which the selected SAN object is a logical member of the zone, wherein a SAN object is a logical member of a zone via relationship of the SAN object to one or more other SAN objects that are physical members of the zone (see paragraph 36).

As per claims 5,14,27,36, Takaoka further discloses that the indicated other SAN object is user selectable to display zoning information for the other SAN object, wherein the zoning information for the other SAN object indicates one or more zones of the SAN of which the other SAN object is a member (see paragraphs 92-93).

5. Claims 3,12,25,34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takaoka as applied to claims 1,10,19,23,32 above, and further in view of Bramhall et al. (US 2003/0195956), herein referred to as Bramhall, further in view of Anslow.

As per claims 3,12,25,34 , although the system disclosed by Takaoka shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the displayed zoning information further indicates one or more zone aliases of the SAN of which the selected SAN object is a logical or physical member.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Takaoka, as evidenced by Bramhall.

In an analogous art, Bramhall discloses a system for ensuring the unique zoning membership representation of a network environment (see Abstract). Further showing an indication of a zone alias that a SAN object is a logical or physical member of (see paragraph 33).

Given the teaching of Bramhall, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Takaoka by employing a zone alias indicator, such as disclosed by Bramhall, in order to add or remove a group of zone participants by alias.

Art Unit: 2153

In considering that a zone alias represents a logical grouping of SAN objects, and wherein a SAN object is a logical member of a zone alias via relationship of the SAN object to one or more SAN objects that are physical members of the zone alias, Anslow shows this in paragraph 36 (see discussion above regarding Anslow and logical and physical interrelationships).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 28, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A) Applicant contends that Takaoka does not disclose a zone visualization mechanism configured to obtain zoning information for a plurality of SAN objects in a SAN.

In considering A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Takaoka shows a zone visualization mechanism in Fig. 8, where a screen is displayed with boxes indicating the zone and the device (i.e. SAN objects) inside the boxes are the devices that are in the zone. See paragraph 67, where further support of the boxes being zones is described by having "The areas 1011 to 1013 respectively correspond to zones 81 to 83 allocated to computer system 80."

B) Applicant contends that Takaoka does not disclose in response to selection of a particular SAN object in the SAN, displaying zoning information for the selected SAN object, wherein the zoning information for the selected SAN object indicates one or more zones of the SAN of which the selected SAN object is a member.

In considering B), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim requires to display zoning information and Takaoka displays zoning information when a SAN object is selected and moved into a zone area. The claim does not say a SAN object cannot be moved into an area to display the object as a member of the zone. In regards to the zone having not yet been created, Takaoka discloses that in response to the operation of the user, the setting of the zones are changed once the SAN object is dropped into the area (see paragraph 105). The claim does not say the zone has to already exist before the display of the zoning information, only that it is in

Art Unit: 2153

response to selecting a particular SAN object. Takaoka still meets the limitations of the claims because in response to selecting the SAN object (i.e. dragging and dropping into an area), the new area that is displayed contains the SAN object and the zoning information of which the SAN object is a member (i.e. the SAN object is located within the rectangular area described in paragraph 67).

C) Applicant contends that Takaoka does not disclose wherein the displayed zoning information indicates logical zone membership for the selected SAN object, wherein a SAN object is a logical member of a zone via relationship of the SAN object to one or more SAN objects that are physical members of the zone.

In considering C), Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00 (1st Friday Off).


Art Unit: 2153

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Philip J Chea
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

PJC 11/26/07



GLENN B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100